arXiv:1611.05224v2 [stat.ME] 21 Jan 2017

Robust Statistical Inference Based on a New Family of Divergences Originating from Model Adequacy Tests

Abhik Ghosh and Ayanendranath Basu
Interdisciplinary Statistical Research unit
Indian Statistical Institute
203 B. T. Road, Kolkata 700 108, India
abhianik@gmail.com, ayanbasu@isical.ac.in

Abstract

Minimum divergence methods are popular tools in a variety of statistical applications. We consider tubular model adequacy tests, and demonstrate that the new divergences that are generated in the process are very useful in robust statistical inference. In particular we show that the family of S-divergences can be alternatively developed using the tubular model adequacy tests; a further application of the paradigm generates a larger superfamily of divergences. We describe the properties of this larger class and its potential applications in robust inference. Along the way, the failure of the first order influence function analysis in capturing the robustness of these procedures is also established.

1 Introduction and Preliminaries

Divergence measures are frequently used in statistics and information theory. Minimum divergence techniques form an important component of modern statistical analysis. Applications based on such techniques have become quite popular in recent times due to their strong robustness properties against outlying observations. Many density-based statistical divergences produce highly robust estimators along with high (sometimes even full) asymptotic efficiency and hence constitute a large class of useful generalizations of the classical maximum likelihood estimator which is known to be extremely sensitive to the outliers. Popular examples of such divergence measures include the Kullback-Leibler divergence (KLD), the Bregman divergence (Bregman, 1967), the power divergence (PD) family of Cressie and Read (1984), the density power divergence (DPD) family of Basu et al. (1998), the generalized Kullback-Leibler (GKL) family of Park and Basu (2003), the S-divergence family of Ghosh et al. (2016) and many more; see Beran (1977), Tamura and Boos (1986), Simpson (1987, 1989b), Lindsay (1994), Pardo (2006), Basu et al. (2011), Ghosh et al. (2016) for details. Some of these works have provided generalizations of existing families of divergence measures which extend the scope of statistical inference based on available divergences at that point of time. As our understanding improved and new divergences came along, it has been possible to provide better trade-off between the dual goals in parametric estimation; efficiency under the model and robustness away from it.

However, search for such divergences has often been ad-hoc, and researchers have often relied on intuitive generalizations or empirical evidence. In the present paper, we will study a systematic procedure of generating new (larger) divergence families through suitable model adequacy tests based on existing divergences. The model adequacy tests were indeed proposed as an alternative to the divergence based chi-square type goodness-of-fit tests, since the latter group generally fails to pick out any specific model when the sample size is sufficiently large (Liu and Lindsay, 2009). For all the chi-square type goodness-of-fit tests, any specified model

would be eventually edged out by a more complicated model and hence these tests fail to assess if the specified model is actually a good approximation or not. It may be that the specified model (simple and easily workable) is already very close to the true data generating distribution (i.e, the discrepancy between them is very small, within practically acceptable range), yet these chi-square type goodness-of-fit tests might get rejected for large sample sizes in favor of more complicated models which have marginally lower discrepancy but are otherwise hard to work with. In this respect model adequacy tests can be helpful and allow us to test if the simpler specified model is within an acceptable range of the true density (Rudas et al., 1994; Hodges and Lehmann, 1954; Goutis and Robert, 1998; Dette and Munk, 2003; Liu and Lindsay, 2009). Here, we will consider the model adequacy tests based on divergence measures as described below.

More generally, let us use the term "density" for both the discrete or continuous probabilities and consider the class $\mathcal{G}$ of all density functions which are absolutely continuous with respect to some common dominating measure μ. In case of continuous variables this dominating measure is the Lebeague measure while in case of discrete variables it is a suitable counting measure. Define a general statistical divergence $\rho(g, f)$ between two density functions g and f as a non-negative function from $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G}$ to $[0, \infty)$ which equals zero if and only if $g = f$, identically. For such a general statistical divergence, we can say that the assumed model $\mathcal{F} = \{f\}$ is adequate at level c with respect to the true probability density g if the distance of g from the model family $\mathcal{F}$, defined as $\rho(g, \mathcal{F}) = \inf_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \rho(g, f)$, is less than or equal to c. So our general model adequacy test considers the null hypothesis

$$H_0 \ : \ \rho(g, \mathcal{F}) \leq c. \tag{1}$$

Given c, one can construct suitable test statistics for solving the problem of model adequacy; however, for our purpose, we will consider the divergence based tests which also include the likelihood ratio test. This will help to illustrate the process of generating new divergence families through model adequacy tests as was done by Liu and Lindsay (2009). They constructed the tolerance region in the null hypothesis (1) in terms of the Kullback-Leibler divergence (KLD) defined as

$$\mathrm{KLD}(g, f) = \int f \log(f/g) d\mu. \tag{2}$$

The details of this construction will be presented in Section 2. Note that the KLD is adjoint to the popular likelihood divergence (LD) given by

$$\mathrm{LD}(g, f) = \int g \log(g/f) d\mu, \tag{3}$$

obtained by reversing the roles of f and g. Liu and Lindsay (2009) went on to construct the likelihood ratio test statistic (based on the LD) for the model adequacy test with $\rho = \mathrm{KLD}$ and illustrated several nice properties of this approach. Specifically and interestingly, their approach of building the model adequacy region and test independently yields the GKL family that had already been shown to produce highly robust estimators by Park and Basu (2003). This one parameter divergence family, which connects the likelihood divergence (LD) and the Kullback-Leibler divergence smoothly, is defined as

$$\mathrm{GKL}_\tau(g, f) = \int \left[\frac{g}{\bar{\tau}} \log\left(\frac{g}{f}\right) - \left(\frac{g}{\bar{\tau}} + \frac{f}{\tau}\right) \log\left(\tau \frac{g}{f} + \bar{\tau}\right) \right] d\mu, \quad \bar{\tau} = 1 - \tau, \ \tau \in [0, 1]. \tag{4}$$

These divergences can be obtained as the solution to the optimization problem

$$\tau\bar{\tau}\mathrm{GKL}_\tau(g, f) = \min_{p \in \mathcal{G}} \left[\tau \mathrm{LD}(g, p) + \bar{\tau}\mathrm{KLD}(p, f)\right], \quad \bar{\tau} = 1 - \tau, \tag{5}$$

and this optimization problem arises while constructing the likelihood ratio test statistic for the model adequacy test of Liu and Lindsay (2009); the detailed process is described and extended in Sections 2 and 3 for more general divergence based model adequacy tests.

This nice interpretation of the development of the GKL family has also been briefly noted by Park and Basu (2003) independently. Further, Park and Basu (2003) have indicated another model adequacy test, obtained by reversing the role of KLD and the LD, i.e., considering ρ as the LD in the null hypothesis (1) and developing the KLD based test for it, would generate another well-known divergence family, namely the Cressie-Read Power Divergence (PD) family. This PD family, originally introduced by Cressie and Read (1984), is defined as

$$\mathrm{PD}_\lambda(g,f) = \frac{1}{\lambda(\lambda+1)} \int g[(g/f)^\lambda - 1] d\mu, \tag{6}$$

and has several useful applications in robust statistical inference (see Basu and Lindsay, 1994; Basu et al., 2011, etc.). In terms of the solution of a model adequacy testing approach, it can be expressed as

$$\tau\bar{\tau}\mathrm{PD}_\tau(g,f_0) = \min_{p\in\mathcal{G}} \left[\tau \mathrm{KLD}(g,p) + \bar{\tau}\mathrm{LD}(p,f_0)\right], \quad \bar{\tau} = 1-\tau. \tag{7}$$

The above discussion invokes a natural question: can we obtain some larger superfamily of statistical divergences, that could be further helpful in robust statistical inference like the PD or the GKL families, through more general model adequacy tests? In this paper, we try to answer this interesting question by exploring some model adequacy tests based on more general divergences (rather than KLD and LD only). We first consider a recent generalization of the PD family, namely the two-parameter S-divergence family of Ghosh et al. (2016), and illustrate that it can also be obtained from a suitable model adequacy test based on appropriate generalizations of the LD and KLD in Section 2. These generalizations of the LD and the KLD are indeed seen to be the special cases of the S-divergence family. So, we further generalize our model adequacy test by replacing KLD and LD by appropriate members of the general S-divergence family and explore its properties in Section 3. These require some non-trivial generalization of the work of Liu and Lindsay (2009) in order to provide a general class of divergence based model adequacy tests which increases the novelty of this work. Further, as expected, this general S-divergence based model adequacy tests again generate another *new* and larger super-family of divergences which, interestingly, contains both the S-divergence family and the GKL family as its subclasses. This is another novel discovery within the literature of the density based divergences and the related robust statistical inference. We refer to this larger three parameter superfamily of divergences as the Generalized S-divergence (GSD) family and explore some of its basic properties in Section 4. The potential applications of this GSD superfamily in robust statistical inference have been investigated in Section 5 along with the asymptotic and robustness properties of the resulting estimators. Section 6 presents some numerical illustrations of the performance of GSD based inference and the paper ends with some concluding remarks in Section 7.

Before concluding this section, we summarize, in an itemized manner, the major contributions of this paper.

- We explore the process of generating new divergence families from suitable model adequacy tests. This technique is not entirely unknown in the literature; however it certainly has not received adequate attention and its application has been limited to the one parameter GKL and PD families.

- We demonstrate that the two parameter family of S-divergences, which has been recently proposed and studied in the literature, can be generated through appropriate model adequacy tests in the same spirit.

- We demonstrate that a further application of this technique leads to the generation of an entirely new family of divergences which is a super-class containing the S-divergence family as a special case.

- An exploration of the properties of the divergences within this super-class demonstrates that the divergences within this super-class which appear to provide the best combinations of robustness and efficiency do not belong to any of the previously studied subclasses of this super-class. This indicates that studying the properties of the individual subclasses may not be sufficient to identify the "best" divergence in respect of robust parametric estimation, so that this super-class does make some positive value addition to the literature.

- A study of the minimum divergence estimators generated by the above superclass reveals the limitation of the first order influence function analysis in assessing their robustness.

Finally, we emphasize once more, that the primary intent in this paper is in developing new families of divergences, and not in model adequacy tests per se, although we use the latter tool extensively in generating our new families of divergences.

2 S-Divergence Family from A Suitable Model Adequacy Test

The S-divergence family of density-based divergences, recently developed by Ghosh et al. (2016), is a two-parameter (α, λ) generalization of the PD family that connects each member of the PD family (having parameter λ) at $\alpha = 0$ to the L_2 divergence at $\alpha = 1$. This family is defined as

$$S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(g, f) = \int \left[\frac{1}{A} f^{1+\alpha} - \frac{1+\alpha}{AB} f^B g^A + \frac{1}{B} g^{1+\alpha} \right] d\mu, \tag{8}$$

where $A = 1 + \lambda(1-\alpha)$ and $B = \alpha - \lambda(1-\alpha)$. Clearly, $A + B = 1 + \alpha$. Also the above form is defined only when $A \neq 0$ and $B \neq 0$; for $A = 0$ or $B = 0$ the corresponding S-divergence measure is defined by the continuous limit of (8) as $A \to 0$ or $B \to 0$ respectively. Further, at the choice $\lambda = 0$, this S-divergence family contains another popular divergence family, namely the density power divergence (DPD) family of Basu et al. (1998) having parameter $\alpha > 0$, defined as

$$\mathrm{DPD}_\alpha(g, f) = \int f^{1+\alpha} d\mu - \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} \int f^\alpha g d\mu + \frac{1}{\alpha} \int g^{1+\alpha} d\mu. \tag{9}$$

Note that the S-divergences measures are not symmetric in general. But it becomes symmetric if and only if either $\alpha = 1$ (which generates the L_2 divergence), or $\lambda = -\frac{1}{2}$. The latter case represents an interesting subclass referred to as the S-Hellinger Distances (SHD) in Ghosh et al. (2016) and is defined by

$$\mathrm{SHD}_\alpha(g, f) = S_{(\alpha,\lambda=-1/2)}(g, f) = \frac{2}{1+\alpha} \int \left(g^{(1+\alpha)/2} - f^{(1+\alpha)/2} \right)^2. \tag{10}$$

It connects the Hellinger distance at $\alpha = 0$ to L_2 divergence at $\alpha = 1$. Note that just as the Hellinger distance represents the self adjoint member of the PD family, any other cross section of the class of S-divergences for a fixed value α has a self adjoint member in $S_{(\alpha,-1/2)}$.

The applications of S-divergences in robust parametric inferences have been described in Ghosh (2015), Ghosh and Basu (2015, 2016) and Ghosh et al. (2015, 2016). It has been illustrated that some members of the S-divergence family generate more robust inference compared to its existing members within the PD and DPD subfamilies. However, in terms of Broniatowski et al. (2012), the S-divergences are not decomposable except for the special cases $\lambda = 0$ (the DPD) or $\alpha = 1$ (the L_2 divergence) and hence require the use of a non-parametric kernel density estimator

for performing minimum divergence estimation under continuous models; a possible alternative approach may be developed along the line of Broniatowski and Keziou (2009) and Toma and Broniatowski (2010).

In this paper, we demonstrate that one can obtain the S-divergence family from the suitable model adequacy test extending the arguments of Liu and Lindsay (2009). Since the S-divergence family is an extension of the PD family, we should be able to obtain it as a solution of suitable generalization of the testing problem (7). So, it is intuitive to construct the required model adequacy test based on similar extensions of the KLD and LD divergences through the parameter α. We consider the particular subfamily within the S-divergence family having this property (corresponding to $A = 0$ and $B = 0$ respectively) which are given by

$$\mathrm{SKL}_\alpha(g, f) = \int f^{1+\alpha} \log\left(\frac{f}{g}\right) d\mu - \int \frac{(f^{1+\alpha} - g^{1+\alpha})}{1+\alpha} d\mu, \tag{11}$$

and

$$\mathrm{SLD}_\alpha(g, f) = \int g^{1+\alpha} \log\left(\frac{g}{f}\right) d\mu - \int \frac{(g^{1+\alpha} - f^{1+\alpha})}{1+\alpha} d\mu, \tag{12}$$

for all $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. In particular, at the choice $\alpha = 0$, the above families simplify, respectively, to the KLD and the LD measures. Further, Liu and Lindsay (2009) have noted a special geometric structure between the KLD and the LD which cancels the curvatures of each other to generate the new family of divergence measures. It is the property that any one of these two divergences can be obtained from the other just by interchanging g and f, i.e., in the language of Jimenez and Shao (2001), the LD and KLD are adjoint to each other; they are also symmetrically opposite to each other within the PD family, with the Hellinger distance (HD) measure being the point of symmetry. This special geometry also holds for our SLD and SKL families at any given α, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{SKL}_\alpha(g, f) = \mathrm{SLD}_\alpha(f, g), \quad f, g \in \mathcal{G},\ \alpha \in [0, 1).$$

Further, they are also symmetrically opposite to the only self-adjoint subfamily, namely the SHD family, within the S-divergence family of divergences; this fact can be easily verified from the plots of the lines $A = 0$ and $B = 0$ in the (α, λ) plane, as shown in Figure 1, which are clearly symmetric around the line $\lambda = -1/2$ for each $\alpha \in [0, 1)$. The line $\alpha = 1$ is the asymptote of both these lines as $\lambda \to \pm\infty$ respectively which justifies the fact that S-divergences with $\alpha = 1$ are independent of the choice of λ and are always self-adjoint too. These geometrical properties of the SKL and SLD families intuitively indicate that the use of the members of the SKL and SLD families at any particular $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ in constructing the model adequacy test would possibly generate the corresponding cross-section of the S-divergence family with the same α. We prove this intuition rigorously in the rest of this section.

Take any fixed $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and a tolerance limit c. We want to test whether our model is adequate in terms of the SLD_α divergence at level c. This is equivalent to testing for the null hypothesis

$$H_0 : \mathrm{SLD}_\alpha(g, \mathcal{F}) \leq c.$$

Let us construct a divergence based test (rather than the LRT) for this null hypothesis using the SKL with the same tuning parameter α. These divergence based tests are quite robust compared to the LRT as explored in Ghosh et al. (2015) and Ghosh and Basu (2016). Then, based on a sample of size n, the resulting test statistic would be $2n\mathrm{SKL}_\alpha(g, \hat{f}_c)$, where $\hat{f}_c$ is the estimated density under the null hypothesis obtained by minimizing the SKL divergence between the true density g and the model f over all possible model densities satisfying the null hypothesis. Thus, $\hat{f}_c$ is nothing but the solution of the constrained optimization problem

$$\min_{p \in \mathcal{G}} \mathrm{SKL}_\alpha(g, p) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathrm{SLD}_\alpha(p, \mathcal{F}) \leq c. \tag{13}$$



Figure 1: The position of the SKL family ($A = 0$) and the SLD family ($B = 0$) on the (α, λ)-plane of the S-divergence family, relative to the self-adjoint members (dashed line, at λ =-0.5)

As in Liu and Lindsay (2009), we transfer this constrained optimization problem to an equivalent simpler unconstrained optimization problem.

For simplicity, let us first assume that the model family contains only one element, i.e., $\mathcal{F} = \{f_0\}$. Then, the constrained problem (13) simplifies to

$$\min_{p \in \mathcal{G}} \mathrm{SKL}_\alpha(g, p) \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathrm{SLD}_\alpha(p, f_0) \leq c. \tag{14}$$

Theorem 2.1 *The constrained optimization problem (14) has a unique solution, on the boundary, having the form*

$$\hat{f}_c = \hat{f}_\tau = g^\tau f_0^{(1-\tau)}, \tag{15}$$

for some $\tau \in [0, 1]$*, a function of given c, defined through the boundary condition*

$$\mathrm{SLD}_\alpha(\hat{f}_c, f_0) = c. \tag{16}$$

Further, starting from a fixed $\tau \in [0, 1]$ we can see that the simpler unconstrained problem

$$\min_p \left[\tau \mathrm{SKL}_\alpha(g, p) + \bar{\tau} \mathrm{SLD}_\alpha(p, f_0)\right], \quad \bar{\tau} = 1 - \tau, \tag{17}$$

has the solution $\hat{f}_\tau$ of the same form as (15). The formulations presented earlier in the Introduction through Equations (5) and (7) are exactly in the same spirit for the particular cases when the divergences are the LD and the KLD. As argued in Liu and Lindsay (2009), there is a direct one to one correspondence between the parameters τ and c in the two optimization problems in (17) and (14) respectively through (16). Thus our targeted quantity $\hat{f}_c$ in our model adequacy test statistic $2n\mathrm{SKL}_\alpha(g, \hat{f}_c)$ can be easily obtained as the solution to the simpler unconstrained optimization problem in (17) with a suitable τ-value satisfying (16).

Now, suppose the model family $\mathcal{F}$ contains more than one element indexed by the parameter θ as $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\theta\}$. Then, we should extend the unconstrained problem in (17) to the optimization problem

$$\min_p \left[\tau \mathrm{SKL}_\alpha(g, p) + \bar{\tau} \mathrm{SLD}_\alpha(p, \mathcal{F})\right] \equiv \min_\theta \min_p \left[\tau \mathrm{SKL}_\alpha(g, p) + \bar{\tau} \mathrm{SLD}_\alpha(p, f_\theta)\right]. \tag{18}$$

Again we can show that the required solution to the constrained optimization problem in (13) is nothing but the solution to this unconstrained problem in (18) with some appropriate value of τ satisfying $c = \mathrm{SLD}_\alpha(\hat{f}_\tau, \mathcal{F}) = \min_\theta \mathrm{SLD}_\alpha(\hat{f}_\tau, f_\theta)$. Further, the inner minimization in (18)

is of the form (17) and has the explicit solution $\hat{f}_\tau = g^\tau f_\theta^{\bar{\tau}}$. Substituting this solution, the final optimization problem in (18) becomes

$$\min_\theta \left[\tau \text{SKL}_\alpha(g, \hat{f}_\tau) + \bar{\tau}\text{SLD}_\alpha(\hat{f}_\tau, f_\theta)\right]. \tag{19}$$

However, some routine algebra shows that

$$\begin{aligned}\left[\tau \text{SKL}_\alpha(g, \hat{f}_\tau) + \bar{\tau}\text{SLD}_\alpha(\hat{f}_\tau, f_\theta)\right] &= \left[\tau \text{SKL}_\alpha(g, g^\tau f_\theta^{\bar{\tau}}) + \bar{\tau}\text{SLD}_\alpha(g^\tau f_\theta^{\bar{\tau}}, f_\theta)\right] \\ &= \tau\bar{\tau} S_{(\alpha,\lambda_\tau)}(g, f_\theta), \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where $\bar{\tau} = 1 - \tau$ and λ_τ is a function of τ defined as

$$\lambda_\tau = \frac{\alpha\tau - \bar{\tau}}{1-\alpha}. \tag{21}$$

Therefore, our required solution $\hat{f}_\tau$ is nothing but the model element $f_{\hat{\theta}_\tau}$ with $\hat{\theta}_\tau$ being the minimum S-divergence estimator defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_\tau = \arg\min_\theta S_{(\alpha,\lambda_\tau)}(g, f_\theta).$$

Thus, our model adequacy test based on SKL_α independently yields the form of the S-divergence measure with appropriate parameter and also directly depends on the corresponding minimum S-divergence estimator which has nice robustness properties with respect to the outliers in the sample data (Ghosh et al., 2016).

Further, noting that, given $\alpha < 1$, λ_τ is a one-to-one function of τ, and any S-divergence measure with parameter $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $\lambda \in [0, \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}]$ can be obtained from the model adequacy based on the SKL with the same α and the appropriate value of c obtained from $\tau = \frac{\lambda(1-\alpha)+1}{\alpha+1}$. Therefore the S-divergence family has a direct one to one correspondence with the model adequacy test based on SKL and SLD.

3 S-Divergence based General Model Adequacy Tests

The nice and interesting interpretation of the S-divergence measures as discussed in the previous section invokes a natural question. What if we start with a more general divergence family instead of the SLD and SKL? Will we get an even larger superfamily of divergences in that case? In order to answer these questions, we now develop a general model adequacy test based on suitable members of the S-divergence family.

Noting the special geometric curvatures of the SKL and SLD families and the fact that the whole S-divergence family is symmetric about $\lambda = -\frac{1}{2}$, we may try to replace the SKL and SLD by suitable members of the general S-divergence family. More precisely, for any $\alpha \in [0, 1)$, we want to consider two S-divergence measures with parameters (α, λ') and (α, λ'') in place of SLD_α and SKL_α in such a way that their geometric curvatures cancel each other just like SKL and SLD. That is, these two members should be symmetrically opposite with respect to the line $\lambda = -1/2$ and satisfy

$$S_{(\alpha,\lambda')}(g, f) = S_{(\alpha,\lambda'')}(f, g), \quad \forall\ f, g \in \mathcal{G}.$$

From the derivations of the previous section, we may take $\lambda' = \frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha}$ for some $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and then the above requirements give us the choice $\lambda'' = \frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha}$. So, we consider the null hypothesis

$$H_0 : S_{(\alpha, \frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(g, \mathcal{F}) \leq c, \tag{22}$$

and construct the model adequacy test based on $S_{(\alpha,\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(f,g)$. Note that the choice $\gamma=-1$ yields the model adequacy test of the previous section based on SKL and SLD.

Based on a sample of size n, we take an estimate g of the true density and define the test statistics for the model adequacy test of the hypothesis (22) as given by

$$T_n = 2nS_{(\alpha,\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(g,\hat{f}_c), \tag{23}$$

where $\hat{f}_c$ is the best model element (with respect to the $S_{(\alpha,\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha})}$ measure) under the restriction imposed by the null hypothesis in (22). Thus, the $\hat{f}_c$ can be obtained as the solution of the constrained optimization problem

$$\min_p S_{(\alpha,\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(g,p) \quad \text{subject to} \quad S_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(p,\mathcal{F}) \le c. \tag{24}$$

Proceeding as in the previous section, we can again show that the unique solution to the above constrained optimization problem with general model family $\mathcal{F}=\{f_\theta\}$ is nothing but the unique solution $\hat{f}_\tau$ of the unconstrained optimization problem

$$\min_{p\in\mathcal{F}}\left[\tau S_{(\alpha,\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(g,p)+\bar{\tau}S_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(p,\mathcal{F})\right] \equiv \min_\theta \min_p \left[\tau S_{(\alpha,\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(g,p)+\bar{\tau}S_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(p,f_\theta)\right], \tag{25}$$

for some $\tau\in[0,1]$ that depends on the tolerance limit c through the relation

$$c = S_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(\hat{f}_\tau,\mathcal{F}) = \min_\theta S_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(\hat{f}_\tau,f_\theta).$$

To see this, we again consider the one element model family as $\mathcal{F}=\{f_0\}$. Then, the following theorem presents the solution of the simplified version of the constrained problem (24) given by

$$\min_p S_{(\alpha,\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(g,p) \quad \text{subject to} \quad S_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(p,f_0) \le c. \tag{26}$$

The proof of the theorem follows from the method of Lagrange multiplier and is hence omitted.

Theorem 3.1 *The constrained optimization problem (26) has a unique solution, on the boundary, having the form*

$$\hat{f}_c = \hat{f}_\tau = \left[\tau g^{1+\gamma}+(1-\tau)f_\theta^{1+\gamma}\right]^{\frac{1}{1+\gamma}}, \quad \text{if } \gamma\neq -1, \tag{27}$$

$$= g^\tau f_\theta^{(1-\tau)}, \quad \text{if } \gamma=-1, \tag{28}$$

for some $\tau\in[0,1]$, a function of given c, defined through the condition $S_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(\hat{f}_\tau,f_0)=c$.

However, we can immediately check that the solution $\hat{f}_\tau$ as given in the above theorem is also the unique solution to the much simpler unconstrained optimization problem

$$\min_{p\in\mathcal{F}}\left[\tau S_{(\alpha,\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(g,p)+\bar{\tau}S_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(p,f_0)\right], \tag{29}$$

for the τ value satisfying $S_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(\hat{f}_\tau,f_0)=c$.

Now, for the general model family $\mathcal{F}=\{f_\theta\}$, we need to extend this simpler unconstrained problem to the problem in (25) which again has the same solution as to the constrained optimization problem in (24). Clearly, the inner minimization in (25) has an explicit solution $\hat{f}_\tau$ of the form given in Theorem 3.1 and hence the optimization problem in (25) reduces to the form

$$\min_\theta\left[\tau S_{(\alpha,\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(g,\hat{f}_\tau)+(1-\tau)S_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(\hat{f}_\tau,f_\theta)\right]. \tag{30}$$

For $\gamma \neq -1$, we can simplify the argument in the above optimization problem (30) as

$$\left[\tau S_{(\alpha,\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(g,\hat{f}_\tau) + (1-\tau) S_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha})}(\hat{f}_\tau, f_\theta)\right] = \tau\bar{\tau} Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g,f_\theta), \quad \gamma \neq -1 \tag{31}$$

where $\bar{\tau} = 1-\tau$ and $Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g,f)$ is defined as

$$Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g,f) = \frac{1}{\tau\bar{\tau}(\alpha-\gamma)} \int \left[\left\{\tau\left(\frac{g}{f}\right)^{1+\alpha} + \bar{\tau}\right\} - \left\{\tau\left(\frac{g}{f}\right)^{1+\gamma} + \bar{\tau}\right\}^{\frac{1+\alpha}{1+\gamma}}\right] f^{1+\alpha} d\mu. \tag{32}$$

The case $\gamma = -1$ is identical to that considered in the previous section and hence leads to the appropriate member of the S-divergence family which can also be shown to be equal to $\lim_{\gamma\to -1} Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g,f)$. Then the required solution $\hat{f}_\tau$ is given by the model element $f_{\hat{\theta}_\tau}$ with

$$\hat{\theta}_\tau = \arg\min_\theta Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g,f_\theta).$$

Thus, our general model adequacy test based on the S-divergences yields a new divergence function through the quantity $Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g,f)$. This function $Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g,f)$ can be easily extended to the cases $\tau = 0,1$ and $\alpha = \gamma$ through continuous limits of the above form and define a three-parameter family of proper statistical divergence measures. Further the choice $\gamma = -1$ reduces the general divergence measure $Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g,f)$ to the suitable S-divergence measure with parameters α and λ_τ (defined in (21)). So, we refer to this general three parameter family as the "Generalized Super-Divergence (GSD) Family" and discuss its properties in detail in the next section.

Note that given the generated sample data, we can easily compute the model adequacy test statistics by using the minimum GSD estimators (MGSDEs) of the model parameter θ. Hence the performance and robustness of this general model adequacy test directly depend on that of the minimum GSD estimators. In the rest of this paper, we primarily illustrate the properties of the GSD and the corresponding estimators in detail and leave the detailed analysis of this resulting general model adequacy test for our future research work.

4 The Generalized S-Divergence Family and Basic Properties

The generalized S-divergence (GSD) family, as derived in the previous section, is a three parameter family of statistical divergences $Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g,f)$ defined in Equation (32) for $\alpha \in [0,1)$, $\tau \in (0,1)$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R} - \{-1\}$ with $\gamma \neq \alpha$. We can easily extend this family to be defined over the parameter values $\alpha \in [0,1]$, $\tau \in [0,1]$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ through their continuous limits in the form given by Equation (32). In Table 1, we have listed several divergences or families of divergences which belong to the GSD family. Many (although not all) of the divergences (or, classes of divergences) listed in Table 1 are obtained as limiting members of the GSD family.

Thus, the generalized S-divergence family contains the existing divergence families like the S-divergence family (and hence the PD and DPD families) and the GKL family of Park and Basu (2003) as its limiting special cases and yields many more interesting new divergence measures. One such interesting new subfamily of the GSD family arises at the limiting choice $\gamma \to \alpha$ which has the form

$$\begin{aligned} & Q_{(\alpha,\alpha,\tau)}(g,f) = \lim_{\gamma\to\alpha} Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g,f) \\ = & \int \frac{g^{1+\alpha}}{\bar{\tau}} \log\left(\frac{g}{f}\right) - \frac{1}{1+\alpha}\int \left(\frac{g^{1+\alpha}}{\bar{\tau}} + \frac{f^{1+\alpha}}{\tau}\right) \log\left(\tau\left(\frac{g}{f}\right)^{1+\alpha} + \bar{\tau}\right) d\mu, \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Table 1: Existing Divergences as Special Cases of the GSD Family

Tuning Parameters (including limiting values)	Divergences (with reduced parameters if appropriate)
α, $\gamma \to -1$, τ	S-Divergence (Eq.8) with α, λ_τ in (Eq.21)
α, γ, $\tau \to 0$	S-Divergence (Eq.8) with α, $\frac{\gamma}{1-\alpha}$
α, γ, $\tau \to 1$	S-Divergence (Eq.8) with α, $\frac{\alpha-1-\gamma}{1-\alpha}$
α, $\gamma \to -1$, $\tau \to 0$	SKL-Divergence (Eq.11) with α
α, $\gamma \to \alpha$, $\tau \to 1$	SKL-Divergence (Eq.11) with α
α, $\gamma \to -1$, $\tau \to 1$	SLD (Eq.12) with α
α, $\gamma \to \alpha$, $\tau \to 0$	SLD (Eq.12) with α
$\alpha = 0$, $\gamma \to 0$, τ	GKL-Divergence (Eq.4) with τ
$\alpha = 0$, $\gamma \to -1$, τ	PD (Eq.6) with λ_τ in (Eq.21)
α, $\gamma \to -1$, $\tau = \frac{1}{1+\alpha}$	DPD (Eq.9) with α
$\alpha = 0$, $\gamma \to 0$, $\tau \to 0$	LD (Eq.3)
$\alpha = 0$, $\gamma \to -1$, $\tau \to 1$	LD (Eq.3)
$\alpha = 0$, $\gamma \to 0$, $\tau \to 1$	KLD (Eq.2)
$\alpha = 0$, $\gamma \to -1$, $\tau \to 0$	KLD (Eq.2)
α, $\gamma = \frac{\alpha-1}{2}$, τ	SHD (Eq.10) with parameter α
$\alpha = 0$, $\gamma = -\frac{1}{2}$, τ	Hellinger Distance

This subfamily is an interesting generalization of the ordinary GKL family, defined in Equation (4), over the parameter $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and simplifies to the GKL family at $\alpha = 0$.

First, we show that all the members of the GSD family represent proper statistical divergences. To see this, we can rewrite the GSD family (32) in terms of the Pearson residual $\delta = \frac{g}{f} - 1$ as

$$Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g, f) = \int C_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\delta) f^{1+\alpha},$$

where

$$C_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\delta) = \frac{1}{\tau\bar{\tau}(\alpha-\gamma)} \left[\left(\tau(\delta+1)^{1+\alpha} + \bar{\tau}\right) - \left(\tau(\delta+1)^{1+\gamma} + \bar{\tau}\right)^{\frac{1+\alpha}{1+\gamma}} \right], \quad \delta \geq -1. \tag{34}$$

This function $C_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\delta)$ is strictly convex in on $[-1, \infty)$ and satisfies the relations

$$C_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(0) = 0 = C'_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(0), \qquad C''_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(0) = 1 + \alpha > 0.$$

Here $'$ and $''$ denote the first and second order derivatives respectively with respect to the argument. Using these properties, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1 *All the functions $Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g, f)$ in the generalized S-divergence family for $\alpha, \tau \in [0, 1]$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ define proper statistical divergences in the sense that, for any two densities $g, f \in \mathcal{G}$,*

$$Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g, f) \geq 0, \qquad \textit{with equality if and only if } \; g = f.$$

Examining the forms of the GSD measures also, we can obtain several interesting properties of this superfamily, which are listed in the following theorem. □

Theorem 4.2 *For any two densities $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$, the generalized S-divergence measure $Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g, f)$ satisfies the following properties:*

1. *For any given α and γ, the GSD is adjoint with respect to $\tau = 1/2$, i.e.,*

$$Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g,f) = Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\bar{\tau})}(f,g).$$

2. *At $\tau = 1/2$, the GSD measure is self-adjoint and symmetric in its arguments yielding an interesting subfamily of the GSD family given by*

$$Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,1/2)}(g,f) = \frac{2}{(\alpha-\gamma)} \int \left[\left(g^{1+\alpha} + f^{1+\alpha}\right) - 2^{-\frac{\alpha-\gamma}{1+\gamma}} \left(g^{1+\gamma} + f^{1+\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1+\alpha}{1+\gamma}} \right]. \tag{35}$$

3. *The GSD measure also becomes symmetric and self-adjoint at $\gamma = \frac{\alpha-1}{2}$, where it becomes independent of the parameter τ and coincides with the SHD family.* □

From the above properties and the limiting forms of the GSD measures (Table 1), we can clearly observe that all the members of the GSD family are not distinct; they become identically equal at two or more choices of the parameter combination (α, γ, τ). For example,

$$Q_{(\alpha,-1,0)} = Q_{(\alpha,\alpha,1)}, \quad Q_{(\alpha,-1,1)} = Q_{(\alpha,\alpha,0)}, \quad Q_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1}{2},\tau)} = Q_{(\alpha,\frac{\alpha-1}{2},\tau')}, \quad \forall\ \alpha,\tau,\tau' \in [0,1].$$

Therefore, it would be an interesting future challenge to find the underlying geometry and functional topological properties of the GSD family and hence characterize all the distinct members within this large superfamily.

5 Application of Generalized S-Divergence Family in Robust Parametric Estimation

5.1 The Set-up and Estimating Equation

Let us consider the parametric model family of densities $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\theta : \theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p\}$. Let F_θ denote the distribution function corresponding to f_θ. We are interested in the estimation of the parameter θ. Let G denote the distribution function corresponding to the true density g. The minimum GSD functional $T_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau}(G)$ at G is then defined by the relation

$$Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g, f_{T_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau}(G)}) = \min_{\theta\in\Theta} Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g, f_\theta), \tag{36}$$

provided the minimum exists. From its definition, the GSD functional $T_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau}(G)$ is Fisher Consistent under the assumption that the model family is identifiable. When G is outside the model, $\theta^g_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau} = T_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau}(G)$ represents the best fitting parameter, and f_{θ^g} is the model element closest to g in the GSD sense. For simplicity, we suppress the subscripts α, γ, τ for $\theta^g_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau}$.

Given the observed sample data, we estimate the parameter θ by minimizing the divergence $Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\hat{g}, f_\theta)$ over $\theta \in \Theta$, where $\hat{g}$ is some non-parametric estimate of the true density g based on the observed sample. When the model is discrete, a simple choice for $\hat{g}$ is given by the relative frequencies; for continuous models there is no such simple choice and we need some non-parametric density estimator. Thus, the estimating equation for the minimum GSD estimator (MGSDE) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \int f_\theta^{1+\alpha} u_\theta d\mu - \int \left(\tau \hat{g}^{1+\gamma} + \bar{\tau} f_\theta^{1+\gamma}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-\gamma}{1+\gamma}} f_\theta^{1+\gamma} u_\theta d\mu &= 0, \\ \text{or} \quad \int K(\delta(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_\theta(x) d\mu(x) &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where $\delta(x) = \delta_n(x) = \frac{\hat{g}(x)}{f_\theta(x)} - 1$ and

$$K(\delta) = \frac{1}{\tau(\alpha-\gamma)}\left[\left(\tau(\delta+1)^{1+\gamma} + \bar{\tau}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-\gamma}{1+\gamma}} - 1\right]. \tag{38}$$

Note that, the function $K(\delta)$ satisfies the relations $K(0) = 0$ and $K'(0) = 1$. Therefore, this estimating equation of the MGSDE is an *unbiased estimating equation* at the model $g = f_\theta$. Further, at any fixed α, the estimating equations of different MGSDEs differ only in terms of the function $K(\cdot)$, just like the case of minimum S-divergence estimators (MSDEs); see Ghosh et al. (2016). Hence, the robustness properties of the resulting estimators are expected to depend at least partially on the form of this $K(\cdot)$ function. However, all the divergences within the GSD family produce affine invariant estimators as described in the following proposition.

Proposition 5.1 *Consider the affine transformation $Y = UX + v$ for a non-singular matrix U and a vector v of the dimension as of X. Then we have*

$$Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g_Y, f_Y) = kQ_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g_X, f_X),$$

where $k = |Det(U)|^{1+\alpha} > 0$. Therefore the divergence measure $Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(g, f)$ is not itself affine invariant, but the corresponding minimum divergence estimator is affine equivariant.

5.2 Robustness properties: Influence Function

The influence function is a popular and useful indicator of the first-order robustness and efficiency of any estimator. Influence function in fact indicates the asymptotic effect of the infinitesimal contamination on the properties of the estimator in the neighborhood of the true distribution (Hampel, 1974; Hampel et al., 1986). More precisely, the influence function of any statistical functional $T(G)$ at the true distribution G is defined as

$$IF(y, T, G) = \frac{\partial}{\partial\epsilon} T(G_\epsilon)\Big|_{\epsilon=0},$$

where G_ϵ is the contaminated distribution $G_\epsilon = (1-\epsilon)G + \epsilon\wedge_y$, ϵ is the contamination proportion and $\wedge_y$ denote the degenerate distribution at the contamination point y. The influence function of a robust estimator should be bounded; its non-boundedness indicates that the first order asymptotic bias of the estimator may diverge to infinity under contamination.

We will now examine the first order robustness of the proposed minimum GSD estimator by deriving its influence function. Let us consider the minimum GSD functional $T_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau}(\cdot)$ as defined in (36), which satisfies the estimating equation (37) with $\hat{g}$ replaced by g. Then, a straightforward differentiation of the estimating equation yields the required influence function as presented in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.2 *Consider the general set-up of the minimum GSD estimator as mentioned in the previous subsection. Then, the influence function of the minimum GSD functional $T_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau}$ is given by*

$$IF(y; T_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau}, G) = J_g^{-1}\left[u_{\theta^g}(y) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\gamma}(y) g^\gamma(y)\left(\tau g^{1+\gamma}(y) + \bar{\tau} f_{\theta^g}^{1+\gamma}(y)\right)^{\frac{\alpha-2\gamma-1}{1+\gamma}} - \xi_g\right] \tag{39}$$

where $\theta^g = T_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau}(G)$,

$$\xi_g = \int u_{\theta^g} f_{\theta^g}^{1+\gamma} g^{1+\gamma}\left(\tau g^{1+\gamma} + \bar{\tau} f_{\theta^g}^{1+\gamma}\right)^{\frac{\alpha-2\gamma-1}{1+\gamma}} d\mu,$$

and

$$J_g = \int u_{\theta g}^T u_{\theta g} K'(\delta_g) f_{\theta g}^{\alpha} g^{\gamma} d\mu - \int ((1+\alpha) u_{\theta g}^T u_{\theta g} + \nabla u_{\theta g}) K(\delta_g) f_{\theta g}^{1_{\alpha}} d\mu, \tag{40}$$

with $\delta_g = \frac{g}{f_{\theta g}} - 1$ *and* ∇ *denoting the gradient with respect to* θ.

Corollary 5.3 *Under the set-up of Theorem 5.2, suppose the true density* g *belongs to the model family* $\mathcal{F}$ *with* $g = f_\theta$. *Then the influence function of the minimum GSD functional has the simpler form*

$$IF(y; T_{\alpha,\gamma,\tau}, F_\theta) = \left(\int u_\theta u_\theta^T f_\theta^{1+\alpha} d\mu \right)^{-1} \left[u_\theta(y) f_\theta^{\alpha}(y) - \int u_\theta f_\theta^{1+\alpha} d\mu \right]. \tag{41}$$

The most interesting and remarkable observation here is that the influence function of the MGSDE at the model is independent of the parameters γ and τ and depends only on the parameter α. Hence the influence function analysis predicts similar behavior (in terms of first order robustness and efficiency) for all minimum GSD estimators with the same value of the parameter α irrespective of the other two parameters γ and τ. Also note that, this influence function is the same as that of the minimum DPD estimator and also the minimum S-divergence estimator with the same value of α. Thus the influence functions of the MGSDEs have bounded re-descending natures except in the case $\alpha = 0$ where it is unbounded. Figure 2 shows the nature of the influence functions for the Poisson-mean (discrete case) and normal-mean (continuous case). Therefore, as per the first order influence function analysis, all the MGSDEs are robust for all $\alpha > 0$ and non-robust at $\alpha = 0$.



Figure 2: Influence function for the MGSDE of θ under the $Poisson(\theta)$ model at the $Poisson(5)$ (first panel) and the normal $N(\theta, 1)$ model at the $N(0, 1)$ (second panel)

In actual practice, the picture given by the first order influence function analysis often leads to an inaccurate prediction of the actual performance of the MGSDE. Our simulation studies in Section 6 will demonstrate that some members of the GSD family having bounded influence functions generate highly non-robust estimators; these choices include small positive α, $\gamma > 0$ and $\tau = 0$. On the other hand some members of the GSD family with $\alpha = 0$, $\gamma < 0$ and $\tau > 0$ (large), in spite of having unbounded influence functions, generate highly robust estimators. Hence, the classical first order influence function analysis cannot portray the true robustness picture for the minimum GSD estimators. As explained above, it may fail in both counts; it may label strongly robust estimators as unstable, and may declare highly unstable estimators as being strongly robust. An appropriate second order influence function analysis may provide a more accurate description of the distortion of the estimators due to contamination. For brevity we do not present the second order analysis in this paper; however this analysis reaffirms and strengthens all the illustrations and conclusions of Ghosh et al. (2016).

5.3 Asymptotic Properties under the Discrete Models

Let us now describe the consistency and asymptotic distribution of the proposed minimum GSD estimators. For simplicity, we will consider only the case of discrete models in this paper. Suppose $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$ are n independent and identically distributed observations from a discrete probability mass function (pmf) g modeled by the parametric family $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\theta : \theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p\}$ and let the distributions be supported, without loss of generality, on $\chi = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$. We assume that both g and $\mathcal{F}$ belong to the class $\mathcal{G}$, where the dominating measure μ is now the counting measure over the support χ.

Under this set-up, we can easily get an estimate $\hat{g}$ of the true pmf g through the relative frequencies defined as $r_n(x) = \dfrac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} I(X_i = x)$, where $I(A)$ denote the indicator function of the event A. So, we can get the MGSDE of θ by minimizing the GSD measure between two probability vectors $\mathbf{r}_n = (r_n(0), r_n(1), r_n(2), \ldots)^T$ and $\mathbf{f}_\theta = (f_\theta(0), f_\theta(1), f_\theta(2), \ldots)^T$ and hence the corresponding estimating equation is given by (37) with $\hat{g}(x)$ replaced by $r_n(x)$ and the integral replaced by summation over χ:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_\theta(x) \quad = \quad 0, \tag{42}$$

where now we have $\delta_n(x) = \frac{r_n(x)}{f_\theta(x)} - 1$.

Now, in order to prove the asymptotic properties of the MGSDE, we consider the matrix J_g as defined in (40) and define

$$V_g = Var_g\left[K'(\delta_g^g(X)) f_{\theta^g}^{\alpha}(X) u_{\theta^g}(X)\right], \tag{43}$$

where Var_g represents the variance under the true density g. Further, we also make the following assumptions:

(A1) The model family $\mathcal{F}$ is identifiable.

(A2) The model probability mass functions f_θ have common support so that the set $\chi = \{x : f_\theta(x) > 0\}$ is independent of θ. The true pmf g is also supported on χ.

(A3) There exists an open subset $\omega \subset \Theta$ for which the best fitting parameter θ^g is an interior point. Further, the pmf $f_\theta(x)$ admits all third order derivatives of the type $\nabla_{jkl} f_\theta(x)$ for almost all x and for all $\theta \in \omega$.

(A4) The matrix J_g, defined in Equation (40), is positive definite.

(A5) The quantities $\sum_x g^{1/2}(x) f_\theta^\alpha(x) |u_{j\theta}(x)|$, $\sum_x g^{1/2}(x) f_\theta^\alpha(x) |u_{j\theta}(x)||u_{k\theta}(x)|$ and $\sum_x g^{1/2}(x) f_\theta^\alpha(x) |u_{jk\theta}(x)|$ are bounded for all j, k and for all $\theta \in \omega$.

(A6) For almost all x, there exist functions $M_{jkl}(x)$, $M_{jk,l}(x)$, $M_{j,k,l}(x)$ that dominate, in absolute value,

$$f_\theta^\alpha(x) u_{jkl\theta}(x), \quad f_\theta^\alpha(x) u_{jk\theta}(x) u_{l\theta}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad f_\theta^\alpha(x) u_{j\theta}(x) u_{k\theta}(x) u_{l\theta}(x)$$

respectively, for all j, k, l and which are uniformly bounded in expectation with respect to g and f_θ for all $\theta \in \omega$.

(A7) The functions $K'(\delta_g)$ and $K''(\delta_g)\,(\delta_g + 1)$ with $\delta_g = \frac{g(x)}{f_\theta(x)} - 1$ are uniformly bounded for all $\theta \in \omega$.

Then we have the following theorem stating the consistency and asymptotic normality of the MGSDE under the discrete models. For brevity in presentation, its proof has been moved to the Appendix.

Theorem 5.4 *Under the set-up of discrete models as mentioned above and Assumptions (A1)–(A7), the following results hold:*

(a) There exists a consistent sequence θ_n of roots to the minimum GSD estimating equation (42).

(b) The asymptotic distribution of $n^{1/2}(\theta_n - \theta^g)$ is p-dimensional normal with vector mean 0 and covariance matrix $J_g^{-1} V_g J_g^{-1}$. □

Corollary 5.5 *Under the assumption of Theorem 5.4, let us further assume that the true pmf g belongs to the model family $\mathcal{F}$ with $g = f_\theta$. Then, $n^{1/2}(\theta_n - \theta)$ has a simpler asymptotic distribution given by $N_p(0, J^{-1}VJ^{-1})$, where $J = J_\alpha(\theta) = \int u_\theta u_\theta^T f_\theta^{1+\alpha}$ and $V = V_\alpha(\theta) = \int u_\theta u_\theta^T f_\theta^{1+2\alpha} - \xi\xi^T$ with $\xi = \xi_\alpha(\theta) = \int u_\theta f_\theta^{1+\alpha}$.* □

Interestingly, the asymptotic distribution of the MGSDE at the model is independent of the parameters γ and τ. This is also expected from the fact that first order influence functions of these estimators do not depend on γ and τ. Hence, all the MGSDE with the same α (but with different γ and τ) have the same asymptotic efficiency at the assumed model and this efficiency is also quite high for all most common parametric models for small positive values of α. This can be seen by noting the fact that the asymptotic variance and hence the efficiency at the model is exactly same as that of the MSDE or the minimum DPD estimators with the same value of α and their high efficiencies have already been illustrated by Ghosh (2015, Table 1) and Basu et al. (2011, Table 9.1) respectively.

6 Numerical Illustrations: Performance of the MGSDEs

In this section, we will present a simulation study to describe the finite sample performances of the proposed MGSDEs for different choice of the parameters α, γ and τ. Since the minimum GSD estimation under continuous model requires complicated kernel smoothing techniques, for brevity, in this paper we will restrict ourselves to the discrete set-up of Section 5.3.

Let us consider the Poisson distribution with the true parameter value $\theta = 5$. We generate samples of size $n = 50$ from the $Poisson(5)$ distribution and compute the minimum GSD estimators of θ for different values of the tuning parameters α, γ and τ. Repeating the process 1000 times, we compute the empirical bias and MSE of the MGSDEs of θ as given by

$$\text{Emp. Bias} = \frac{1}{1000}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\hat{\theta}^{(i)} - \theta), \qquad \text{Emp. MSE} = \frac{1}{1000}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\hat{\theta}^{(i)} - \theta)^2,$$

where $\hat{\theta}^{(i)}$ denotes the MGSDE obtained at the i-th replication. These empirical biases and the MSEs are reported in Table 2 for some particular values of tuning parameters. These show the performance of the proposed MGSDEs under pure data where there are no outlier issues.

With any sample of finite size, the Poisson model inevitably leads to zero frequencies for infinitely many cells. Some of the divergences within our GSD family have positive powers of the density g in the denominator and consequently are not defined when there are one or more empty cells. This includes, for example, all Cressie-Read divergences with $\lambda \leq -1$. The empty cell problem is a specific and extreme case of the general "inlier problem", where the observed frequencies are substantially lower than the expected frequencies. The GSD with $\alpha = 0$, $\gamma = -1$

and $\tau = 0$ is a case in question, where the divergence is not defined for empty cells. In order to keep a clear focus in the present context, we defer the consideration of the inlier issue in relation to the GSD to be taken up on a future occasion.

Table 2: The Empirical Bias and MSE of the MGSDEs under pure data ($n = 50$)

		Bias					MSE				
		τ					τ				
α	γ	0	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.7	0	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.7
0	0	−0.01	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.13	0.14	0.14
0.1	0	0.00	−0.01	−0.02	−0.04	−0.06	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.11
0.25	0	0.02	0.01	0.00	−0.01	−0.02	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11
0.5	0	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.16	0.12	0.13	0.13	0.13
0	−0.3	−0.06	−0.06	−0.07	−0.09	−0.10	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.11
0.1	−0.3	−0.04	−0.04	−0.05	−0.05	−0.06	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.11
0.25	−0.3	−0.02	−0.02	−0.02	−0.02	−0.02	0.13	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11
0.5	−0.3	−0.03	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.18	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
0	−0.5	−0.10	−0.10	−0.10	−0.10	−0.10	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11
0.1	−0.5	−0.07	−0.07	−0.07	−0.07	−0.06	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11
0.25	−0.5	−0.07	−0.04	−0.04	−0.03	−0.02	0.16	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11
0.5	−0.5	−0.10	−0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.23	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
0	−1	–	−0.37	−0.18	−0.10	−0.06	–	0.30	0.14	0.11	0.10
0.1	−1	0.40	−0.34	−0.13	−0.07	−0.02	1.83	0.31	0.15	0.12	0.11
0.25	−1	0.21	−0.41	−0.11	−0.03	0.00	0.65	0.39	0.19	0.14	0.13
0.5	−1	0.10	−0.50	−0.14	−0.02	0.01	0.35	0.47	0.24	0.17	0.15
0	0.5	0.03	0.02	−0.01	−0.04	−0.08	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.11	0.11
0.1	0.5	0.04	0.03	0.00	−0.02	−0.05	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11
0.25	0.5	0.05	0.03	0.01	0.00	−0.02	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.12	0.12
0.5	0.5	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.14	0.14	0.15	0.16	0.16
0	1	0.06	0.04	0.00	−0.03	−0.07	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.12
0.1	1	0.06	0.05	0.01	−0.01	−0.04	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.12
0.25	1	0.07	0.05	0.02	0.00	−0.01	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12
0.5	1	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.14	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.14
0	1.5	0.08	0.05	0.01	−0.02	−0.06	0.12	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.12
0.1	1.5	0.08	0.06	0.02	−0.01	−0.04	0.12	0.12	0.11	0.12	0.12
0.25	1.5	0.08	0.06	0.02	0.01	−0.01	0.13	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.13
0.5	1.5	0.07	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.14	0.13	0.14	0.14	0.14
1	1.5	–	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.04	–	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.19

Next we examine the robustness of our proposal with respect to contamination/ outliers in the observed data. So, we repeat the above simulation study but after randomly contaminating 10% of each sample by observations from a $Poisson(15)$ distribution; the latter distribution is well separated from the true data generating distribution, which is Poisson(5). The corresponding empirical bias and MSE values obtained are reported in Table 3. If these bias and MSE under the contaminated scenario turn out to be similar to that obtained in case of pure data that will indicate the stability/robustness of the corresponding estimators against the insertion of outlying observations.

The major findings from these simulation results given in Tables 2–3 about the robustness of our proposed MGSDEs along with their pure data performances have been listed below.

1. Under pure data, the absolute bias is minimum at the maximum likelihoods estimator (MLE, corresponding to $\alpha = \gamma = \tau = 0$) as expected. However most of the other members of the GSD family also generate competitive values of the empirical biases.

2. The MSE under pure data is also minimum at MLE and it increases as α increases for any fixed λ and τ. This fact is also expected from the (theoretical) asymptotic variance of the

Table 3: The Empirical Bias and MSE of the MGSDEs under 10% contaminated data ($n = 50$)

		Bias					MSE				
		τ					τ				
α	γ	0	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.7	0	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.7
0	0	0.96	0.41	0.29	0.24	0.21	1.21	0.42	0.29	0.24	0.22
0.1	0	0.58	0.20	0.13	0.10	0.06	0.55	0.22	0.18	0.17	0.16
0.25	0	0.31	0.15	0.11	0.09	0.07	0.29	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.16
0.5	0	0.13	0.11	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
0	−0.3	0.28	0.19	0.14	0.11	0.08	0.28	0.23	0.20	0.19	0.19
0.1	−0.3	0.20	0.15	0.12	0.10	0.09	0.22	0.19	0.18	0.18	0.18
0.25	−0.3	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.10	0.09	0.21	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.16
0.5	−0.3	0.01	0.08	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.24	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
0	−0.5	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.11	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
0.1	−0.5	0.10	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.21	0.18	0.18	0.19	0.19
0.25	−0.5	0.05	0.07	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.23	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.17
0.5	−0.5	−0.09	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.32	0.16	0.16	0.16	0.16
0	−1	–	−0.18	0.00	0.11	0.28	–	0.38	0.21	0.20	0.28
0.1	−1	0.39	−0.19	−0.01	0.11	0.25	1.01	0.41	0.19	0.19	0.26
0.25	−1	0.26	−0.31	−0.02	0.08	0.19	0.66	0.42	0.26	0.20	0.21
0.5	−1	0.11	−0.46	−0.11	0.08	0.16	0.30	0.63	0.26	0.21	0.23
0	0.5	2.52	0.29	0.15	0.09	0.04	7.02	0.31	0.19	0.17	0.16
0.1	0.5	2.22	0.24	0.13	0.09	0.05	5.49	0.25	0.18	0.16	0.15
0.25	0.5	1.62	0.18	0.12	0.08	0.06	3.03	0.20	0.17	0.15	0.15
0.5	0.5	0.55	0.16	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.53	0.20	0.18	0.18	0.18
0	1	3.08	0.29	0.14	0.08	0.03	10.34	0.31	0.19	0.16	0.15
0.1	1	2.95	0.24	0.13	0.08	0.04	9.52	0.26	0.18	0.15	0.15
0.25	1	2.70	0.19	0.11	0.08	0.05	8.02	0.21	0.17	0.15	0.15
0.5	1	2.05	0.13	0.10	0.08	0.07	4.80	0.19	0.16	0.16	0.15
0	1.5	3.29	0.27	0.14	0.08	0.03	11.71	0.30	0.18	0.16	0.15
0.1	1.5	3.23	0.23	0.12	0.08	0.04	11.27	0.25	0.17	0.15	0.15
0.25	1.5	3.11	0.18	0.11	0.08	0.05	10.50	0.22	0.17	0.15	0.15
0.5	1.5	2.81	0.13	0.09	0.08	0.07	8.69	0.19	0.17	0.16	0.16
1	1	–	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.11	–	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19

MGSDEs which increases with α at the model. However, the MSEs of most of the other MGSDEs are also quite competitive and hence the loss in efficiency under pure data is not a very serious concern while using those MGSDEs.

3. Under the contaminated scenario, the bias and MSE become quite high for the MLE with respect to the pure data case. But several other members of the GSD family generate stable estimators that do not depart significantly away from their values in pure data.

4. The stable MGSDEs generally correspond to the larger choice of α and τ. In particular, both the bias and MSE generally show a decreasing pattern as we increase the value of the tuning parameters α or τ. Thus, in terms of stability our proposed estimators appear to do better as α (or τ) increases when the other two parameters are held constant.

5. The effect of the third tuning parameter γ on the robustness of the MGSDEs is also quite interesting. For larger values of τ and α, there does not have any significant effect of γ on the robustness of the estimator. But for small values of α or τ, γ affects the robustness of the corresponding MGSDES significantly – the MGSDEs with negative values of γ still generate stable bias and MSEs under contamination indicating a strong degree of robustness, but those corresponding to positive γ become even more unstable than the MLE.

Therefore, combining the above findings, we can see that the proposed minimum GSD estimators are highly robust under data contaminations and yield only a small loss in efficiency under pure data. This makes our proposal very useful in real practice with contaminated data, generating highly robust inference. Further note that, under the contamination scenario considered here, the best estimators within the MGSDE family in terms of both bias and MSE correspond to the generalized S-divergence measure with $0.1 \leq \alpha \leq 0.25$, $1 \leq \gamma \leq 1.5$ and $0.5 \leq \tau \leq 0.7$. Roughly, estimators within these choices of tuning parameters appear to provide the best compromise between efficiency at the model and robustness under data contamination. Interestingly, these GSD measures do not appear to belong to any of the existing divergence measures like PD, GKL and S-divergences; in fact they are far separated from the existing ones. Hence the development of this larger GSD family does not limited only to a theoretical generalization in an academic interest. Rather, they produce new minimum GSD estimators which generates more robust inference compared to the other existing minimum divergence estimators.

Another interesting findings of this simulation exercise is that the robustness of the proposed MGSDEs depends directly on all the three tuning parameters α, γ and τ. However, the classical (first order) influence functions of the MGSDEs predict robustness behavior to be independent of the tuning parameters τ and γ. This clearly indicates the limitation of the (first order) influence function analysis in assessing the robustness of the minimum GSD estimators.

7 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have discussed the divergence based model adequacy tests and its link with some new divergence families. We have shown that the recent general family of the S-divergence can also be obtained from suitable model adequacy tests. We have also considered a more general model adequacy test based on the S-divergence measures which further generates a much larger superfamily of divergences that contains the S-divergence family and also the well-know generalized Kullback-Leibler divergence family as its special case, among others. We have also discussed several interesting properties of this new divergence family that we call the generalized S-divergence family (GSD). We have indicated also the potential application of the GSD family in robust parametric inference; derived the asymptotic properties of the minimum GSD estimators and illustrated their robustness through influence function analysis and suitable numerical illustrations. In this pursuit, we have observed and demonstrated the limitations of the first order influence function in assessing the robustness of these minimum divergence estimators.

The research of this paper in fact opens up a lots of interesting questions for future researchers, both mathematicians and statisticians. The new generalized S-divergence family is seen to have several interesting properties with some identical members within this family. So, it would be an interesting future problem to investigate the topological properties of the GSD measures to characterize the distinct members of this divergence family. Further, the application of the minimum GSD estimators in several statistical inference problems other than parametric estimation will also provide a great value addition to the literature of the robust inference. However, the most interesting future work in this case would be to generalize the connection between the model adequacy test and resulting divergence family. We have seen that starting from a model adequacy test based on one particular divergence one gets a one-parameter family of divergences (PD family or the GKL family); the model adequacy test based on a one parameter divergence family (SKL or SLD) generates a two-parameter divergence family (S-divergence family) and staring from the model adequacy test based on the two parameter S-divergence family we obtained a three-parameter divergence family. Up to this point it seems meaningful since each time we generate a divergence which is better than the existing ones in terms of combining good efficiency and robustness properties. So, a natural question in this regard is how long we

can extend this fact to generate even larger and larger superfamily of divergences. Noting that all the members of the three parameter GSD family are not distinct, this process may eventually end after finite steps where we will get the largest such divergence family including all possible distinct divergences; however this needs a lot more research to arrive at any such conclusion. We hope to pursue some of these extensions in our future endeavors.

Another important area of future research would be to study the usefulness of the new GSD family, developed here, in other different statistical applications. In this paper, we have demonstrated its application in robust parametric estimation. The next immediate application will be in generating robust tests of parametric hypothesis. Note that the asymptotic distributions of the minimum GSD estimators are independent of the parameters λ and τ and thus coincide with that of the minimum DPD estimators with the same value of the tuning parameter α. Hence one can directly use the minimum DPD estimators along with the GSD measure to develop robust testing procedures extending the works of Ghosh et al. (2015) and Ghosh and Basu (2016) where the S-divergences were used in constructing the test statistics. This approach will then avoid the complications of kernel smoothing even under the continuous models and is expected to produce more robust tests than the existing ones based on the S-divergences. We hope to take up this issue in our future research work.

A Appendix: Proof of Theorem 5.4

We will assume that Assumptions (A1)–(A7) hold and consider some useful Lemmas first from Ghosh (2015).

Lemma A.1 (Lemma 1, Ghosh (2015)) *Define* $\eta_n(x) = \sqrt{n}\left(\sqrt{\delta_n(x)} - \sqrt{\delta_g(x)}\right)^2$. *For any* $k \in [0,2]$ *and any* $x \in \chi$, *we have*

1. $E_g[\eta_n(x)^k] \le n^{\frac{k}{2}} E_g[|\delta_n(x) - \delta_g(x)|]^k \le \left[\frac{g(x)(1-g(x))}{f_\theta^2(x)}\right]^{\frac{k}{2}}$.

2. $E_g[|\delta_n(x) - \delta_g(x)|] \le \frac{2g(x)(1-g(x))}{f_\theta(x)}$. □

Lemma A.2 (Lemma 2, Ghosh (2015)) $E_g[\eta_n(x)^k] \to 0$, *as* $n \to \infty$, *for* $k \in [0,2)$ *and* $x \in \chi$. □

Now, let us define the quantities $S_{1n} = \sqrt{n}\sum_x a_n(x) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_\theta(x)$ and $S_{2n} = \sqrt{n}\sum_x b_n(x) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_\theta(x)$, where $a_n(x) = K(\delta_n(x)) - K(\delta_g(x))$ and $b_n(x) = (\delta_n(x) - \delta_g(x))K'(\delta_g(x))$. Note that these two quantities S_{1n} and S_{2n} are different from those considered in Ghosh (2015) in the context of MSDEs since the function $K(\cdot)$ involved here is completely different from that in case of S-divergences. So, the next two lemmas, which yield the asymptotic distributions of these quantities in analogue to Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 of Ghosh (2015), need suitably adjusted proof as described below.

Lemma A.3 *Assume Condition (A5). Then, we have* $E_g|S_{1n} - S_{2n}| \to 0$, *as* $n \to \infty$, *and hence* $S_{1n} - S_{2n} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0$, *as* $n \to \infty$.

Proof : By Lemma 2.15 of Basu et al. (2011) (or, Lindsay, 1994, Lemma 25), there exists some positive constant β such that

$$\tau_n(x) \overset{\text{def.}}{=} \sqrt{n}|a_n(x) - b_n(x)| \le \beta\sqrt{n}\left(\sqrt{\delta_n(x)} - \sqrt{\delta_g(x)}\right)^2 = \beta\eta_n(x).$$

Also, by Lemma A.1, $E_g[\tau_n(x)] \leq \beta \frac{g^{1/2}(x)}{f_\theta(x)}$.
And by Lemma A.2, $E_g[\tau_n(x)] = \beta E_g[\eta_n(x)] \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus we get,

$$\begin{aligned} E_g|S_{1n} - S_{2n}| &\leq \sum_x E_g[\tau_n(x)] f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x)|u_\theta(x)| \\ &\leq \beta \sum_x g^{1/2}(x) f_\theta^{\alpha}(x)|u_\theta(x)| < \infty \quad \text{(by assumption (A5))}. \end{aligned}$$

So, by Dominated Convergence Theorem (DCT), $E_g|S_{1n} - S_{2n}| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.
Hence, by Markov inequality, $S_{1n} - S_{2n} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0$ as $n \to \infty$. □

Lemma A.4 *Suppose V_g defined in (43) is finite. Then under g, $S_{1n} \to^{\mathcal{D}} N(0, V_g)$.*

Proof : Note that, by the previous Lemma A.3, the asymptotic distribution of S_{1n} and S_{2n} are the same. Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{2n} &= \sqrt{n} \sum_x (\delta_n(x) - \delta_g(x)) K'(\delta_g(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_\theta(x) \\ &= \sqrt{n} \sum_x (r_n(x) - g(x)) K'(\delta_g(x)) f_\theta^{\alpha}(x) u_\theta(x) \\ &= \sqrt{n} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[K'(\delta_g(X_i)) f_\theta^{\alpha}(X_i) u_\theta(X_i) - E_g\{K'(\delta_g(X)) f_\theta^{\alpha}(X) u_\theta(X)\} \right] \right) \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} Z \sim N(0, V_g) \quad \text{[by Central Limit Theorem (CLT)]}. \end{aligned}$$ □

Now, we proof our Theorem 5.4 using these Lemmas.

Proof of consistency (Part(a)): Consider the behavior of $Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{f}_\theta)$ on a sphere Q_a which has radius a and center at θ^g. We will show, for sufficiently small a, the probability tends to one that

$$Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{f}_\theta) > Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{f}_{\theta^g}) \ \ \forall \theta \quad \text{on the surface of } Q_a,$$

so that the GSD measure has a local minimum with respect to θ in the interior of Q_a. At this local minimum, the estimating equation must be satisfied. Hence, for any $a > 0$ sufficiently small, the minimum GSD estimating equation has a solution θ_n within Q_a with probability tending to one as $n \to \infty$.

Now taking Taylor series expansion of $Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{f}_\theta)$ about $\theta = \theta^g$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{f}_{\theta^g}) - Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{f}_\theta) &= -\sum_j (\theta_j - \theta_j^g) \nabla_j Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{f}_\theta)|_{\theta=\theta^g} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k} (\theta_j - \theta_j^g)(\theta_k - \theta_k^g) \nabla_{jk} Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{f}_\theta)|_{\theta=\theta^g} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{6} \sum_{j,k,l} (\theta_j - \theta_j^g)(\theta_k - \theta_k^g)(\theta_l - \theta_l^g) \nabla_{jkl} Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{f}_\theta)|_{\theta=\theta^*} \\ &= S_1 + S_2 + S_3, \qquad (say) \end{aligned}$$

where θ^* lies between θ^g and θ. Now, let us consider each terms one-by-one.

For the Linear term S_1, we consider

$$\nabla_j Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{f}_\theta)|_{\theta=\theta^g} = -(1+\alpha) \sum_x K(\delta_n^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x),$$

where $\delta_n^g(x)$ is $\delta_n(x)$ evaluated at $\theta = \theta^g$ and $K(\cdot)$ is defined in (38). Here, we will prove that

$$\sum_x K(\delta_n^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \sum_x K(\delta_g^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x), \tag{44}$$

as $n \to \infty$ and note that the right hand side of (44) is zero by definition of the minimum GSD estimator. Clearly by assumption (A7) and the fact that $r_n(x) \to g(x)$ almost surely (a.s.) by Strong Law of Large Number (SLLN), it follows that

$$|K'(\delta)| < 2C = C_1, \qquad (\text{ say }) \tag{45}$$

for any δ in between $\delta_n^g(x)$ and $\delta_g^g(x)$, uniformly in x. So, by using the one-term Taylor series expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} &|\sum_x K(\delta_n^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x) - \sum_x K(\delta_g^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x)| \\ &\quad \le C_1 \sum_x |\delta_n^g(x) - \delta_g^g(x)| f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) |u_{j\theta^g}(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

However, by Lemma A.1(1), we have

$$E[|\delta_n^g(x) - \delta_g^g(x)|] \le \frac{[g(x)(1-g(x))]^{1/2}}{f_{\theta^g}(x)\sqrt{n}} \to 0, \qquad as \;\; n \to \infty.$$

and, by Lemma A.1(2) along with Assumption (A5), we get

$$E[C_1 \sum_x |\delta_n^g(x) - \delta_g^g(x)| f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) |u_{j\theta^g}(x)|] \le 2C_1 \sum_x g^{1/2}(x) f_{\theta^g}^{\alpha}(x) |u_{j\theta^g}(x)| \;<\; \infty.$$

Hence, by dominated convergence theorem (DCT), we get,

$$E[|\sum_x K(\delta_n^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x) - \sum_x K(\delta_g^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x)|] \to 0,$$

as $n \to \infty$. Then the Markov inequality yields the desired result. Thus, we get

$$\nabla_j Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(\mathbf{r}_n, \mathbf{f}_\theta)|_{\theta=\theta^g} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} 0.$$

Therefore, with probability tending to one, $|S_1| < pa^3$, where a is the radius of Q_a and p is the dimension of θ.

Next let us consider the quadratic term S_2. Clearly

$$\begin{aligned} &\nabla_{jk} Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(r_n, f_\theta)|_{\theta=\theta^g} = \nabla_k \left(-(1+\alpha) \sum_x K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta}(x)|_{\theta=\theta^g} \right) \\ &= -(1+\alpha) \Bigg[-\sum_x K'(\delta_n^g(x)) \left(\delta_n^g(x) + 1\right) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x) u_{k\theta^g}(x) \\ &\qquad + \sum_x K(\delta_n^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{jk\theta^g}(x) + (1+\alpha) \sum_x K(\delta_n^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x) u_{k\theta^g}(x) \Bigg]. \end{aligned}$$

First we will prove that

$$\begin{aligned} &-\sum_x K'(\delta_n^g(x)) \;\; (\delta_n^g(x) + 1) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x) u_{k\theta^g}(x) \\ &\qquad \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} -\sum_x K'(\delta_g^g(x)) \left(\delta_g^g(x) + 1\right) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x) u_{k\theta^g}(x). \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

To see this we get, from Assumption (A7) as in (45), that

$$|K''(\delta)(\delta+1)| < C_2, \quad \text{(say)} \tag{47}$$

for every δ lying in between $\delta_n^g(x)$ and $\delta_g^g(x)$, uniformly in x. So, by using the one-term Taylor series expansion,

$$|K'(\delta_n^g)(\delta_n^g+1) - K'(\delta_g^g)(\delta_g^g+1)| \leq |\delta_n^g - \delta_g^g||K''(\delta_n^*)(\delta_n^*+1) + K'(\delta_n^*)| \leq |\delta_n^g - \delta_g^g|(C_2+C_1).$$

Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_x K'(\delta_n^g(x))\,(\delta_n^g(x)+1)\, f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x) u_{k\theta^g}(x) \right. \\
&\qquad \left. - \sum_x K'(\delta_g^g(x))\,\left(\delta_g^g(x)+1\right) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x) u_{k\theta^g}(x) \right| \\
&\leq (C_1+C_2) \sum_x |\delta_n^g - \delta_g^g| f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) |u_{j\theta^g}(x) u_{k\theta^g}(x)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since by Assumption (A5), $\sum_x g^{1/2}(x) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x)|u_{j\theta^g}(x)u_{k\theta^g}(x)| < \infty$, the desired claim in (46) follows by the similar argument that were used to prove the claim in (44). In a similar fashion, we also get

$$\sum_x K(\delta_n^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{jk\theta^g}(x) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \sum_x K(\delta_g^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{jk\theta^g}(x), \tag{48}$$

$$\sum_x K(\delta_n^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x) u_{k\theta^g}(x) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \sum_x K(\delta_g^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta^g}(x) u_{k\theta^g}(x). \tag{49}$$

So, combining (46), (48) and (49), we have

$$\nabla_k \left(\sum_x K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta}(x)|_{\theta=\theta^g} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} -J_g^{j,k}. \tag{50}$$

But we know that

$$\begin{aligned}
2S_2 &= (1+\alpha) \sum_{j,k} \left\{ \nabla_k \left(\sum_x K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta}(x)|_{\theta=\theta^g} \right) - (-J_g^{j,k}) \right\} (\theta_j - \theta_j^g)(\theta_k - \theta_k^g) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j,k} \left\{ - \left((1+\alpha) J_g^{j,k} \right) (\theta_j - \theta_j^g)(\theta_k - \theta_k^g) \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

Here the absolute value of the first term in the above expression (51) is $< p^2 a^3$ with probability tending to one. And, the second term in (51) is a negative definite quadratic form in the variables $(\theta_j - \theta_j^g)$. Letting λ_1 be the largest eigenvalue of $-(1+\alpha)J_g$, the quadratic form is $< \lambda_1 a^2$. Combining them, we get appropriate constants $c > 0$ and $a_0 > 0$ such that for $a < a_0$, we have $S_2 < -ca^2$ with probability tending to one.

Finally, considering the cubic term S_3, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\nabla_{jkl} Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(r_n, f_\theta)|_{\theta=\theta^*} = \nabla_{kl} \left(-(1+\alpha) \sum_x K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta}(x)|_{\theta=\theta^*} \right) \\
&= -(1+\alpha) \nabla_l \left(- \sum_x K'(\delta_n(x))\,(\delta_n(x)+1)\, f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta}(x) u_{k\theta}(x) \right. \\
&\qquad \left. + \sum_x K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{\alpha}(x) \nabla_{jk} f_\theta(x) + \alpha \sum_x K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{j\theta}(x) u_{k\theta}(x) \right)|_{\theta=\theta^*},
\end{aligned}$$

or,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{1}{1+\alpha}\nabla_{jkl}Q_{(\alpha,\gamma,\tau)}(r_n,f_\theta)|_{\theta=\theta^*}\\
&\quad=\sum_x K''(\delta_n^*(x))\,(\delta_n^*(x)+1)^2\,f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)u_{j\theta^*}(x)u_{k\theta^*}(x)u_{l\theta^*}(x) &(52)\\
&\quad-\sum_x(1+\alpha)K'(\delta_n^*(x))\,(\delta_n^*(x)+1)\,f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)u_{j\theta^*}(x)u_{k\theta^*}(x)u_{l\theta^*}(x) &(53)\\
&\quad-\sum_x K'(\delta_n^*(x))\,(\delta_n^*(x)+1)\,f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)u_{j\theta^*}(x)u_{kl\theta^*}(x) &(54)\\
&\quad-\sum_x K'(\delta_n^*(x))\,(\delta_n^*(x)+1)\,f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)u_{k\theta^*}(x)u_{jl\theta^*}(x) &(55)\\
&\quad-\sum_x K'(\delta_n^*(x))\,(\delta_n^*(x)+1)\,f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)\frac{\nabla_{jk}f_{\theta^*(x)}}{f_{\theta^*(x)}}u_{l\theta^*}(x) &(56)\\
&\quad+\sum_x K(\delta_n^*(x))f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)\frac{\nabla_{jkl}f_{\theta^*(x)}}{f_{\theta^*(x)}} &(57)\\
&\quad+\sum_x \alpha K(\delta_n^*(x))f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)\frac{\nabla_{jk}f_{\theta^*(x)}}{f_{\theta^*(x)}}u_{l\theta^*}(x) &(58)\\
&\quad-\sum_x \alpha K'(\delta_n^*(x))\,(\delta_n^*(x)+1)\,f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)u_{j\theta^*}(x)u_{k\theta^*}(x)u_{l\theta^*}(x) &(59)\\
&\quad+\sum_x \alpha(1+\alpha)K(\delta_n^*(x))f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)u_{j\theta^*}(x)u_{k\theta^*}(x)u_{l\theta^*}(x) &(60)\\
&\quad+\sum_x \alpha K(\delta_n^*(x))f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)u_{j\theta^*}(x)u_{kl\theta^*}(x) &(61)\\
&\quad+\sum_x \alpha K(\delta_n^*(x))f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)u_{k\theta^*}(x)u_{jl\theta^*}(x) &(62)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\delta_n^*(x)=\frac{r_n(x)}{f_{\theta^*}(x)}-1$. Here we will prove that all the terms in the RHS of the above expression are bounded. For the first term (52), we use (47) to get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\sum_x K''(\delta_n^*(x))\,(\delta_n^*(x)+1)^2\,f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)u_{j\theta^*}(x)u_{k\theta^*}(x)u_{l\theta^*}(x)|\le C_2\ \sum_x|\delta_n^*(x)+1|M_{j,k,l}(x)f_{\theta^*}(x)\\
&\quad=C_2\ \sum_x r_n(x)M_{j,k,l}(x)\to C_2\ E_g[M_{j,k,l}(X)]<\infty.\quad\text{[by CLT and Assumption (A6)]}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus term (52) is bounded. Now for the second term (53), we again use (45) to get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&|\sum_x K'(\delta_n^*(x))\,(\delta_n^*(x)+1)\,f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x)u_{j\theta^*}(x)u_{k\theta^*}(x)u_{l\theta^*}(x)|\le C_1\ \sum_x|\delta_n^*(x)+1|M_{j,k,l}(x)f_{\theta^*}(x)\\
&\quad=C_1\ \sum_x r_n(x)M_{j,k,l}(x)\to C_1\ E_g[M_{j,k,l}(X)]<\infty,\quad\text{[by CLT and Assumption (A6)]}
\end{aligned}
$$

so that term (53) is also bounded. Similarly the terms (54), (55), (56) and (59) are bounded as in case of term (53) and using (45) and Assumption (A6). Next for the term (57), we will consider the following:

$$
|K(\delta)|=|\int_{-1}^{\delta}K'(\delta)d\delta|\le C_1|\delta+1|, \tag{63}
$$

so that

$$
|K(\delta_n^*(x))|\le C_1\frac{r_n(x)}{f_{\theta^*}(x)}. \tag{64}
$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\nabla_{jkl} f_{\theta^*}(x)}{f_{\theta^*}(x)} &= u_{jkl\theta^*}(x) + u_{jk\theta^*}(x)u_{l\theta^*}(x) + u_{jl\theta^*}(x)u_{k\theta^*}(x) \\ &\quad + u_{j\theta^*}(x)u_{kl\theta^*}(x) + u_{j\theta^*}(x)u_{k\theta^*}(x)u_{l\theta^*}(x). \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

So,

$$\begin{aligned}|\sum_x K(\delta_n^*(x)) f_{\theta^*}^{1+\alpha}(x) \frac{\nabla_{jkl} f_{\theta^*}(x)}{f_{\theta^*}(x)}| &\leq C_1 \sum_x r_n(x) f_{\theta^*}^{\alpha}(x) |\frac{\nabla_{jkl} f_{\theta^*}(x)}{f_{\theta^*}(x)}| \\ &= C_1 \sum_x r_n(x) M(x) \quad \text{(by CLT)} \\ &\to C_1 \, E_g[M(X)] < \infty, \text{ [by assumption (A6)]}\end{aligned}$$

where $M(x) = M_{jkl}(x) + M_{jk,l}(x) + M_{jl,k}(x) + M_{j,kl}(x) + M_{j,k,l}(x)$. Thus the term (57) is bounded and also similarly the rest of the terms (58), (60), (61) and (62) are bounded. Hence, we get $|S_3| < ba^3$ on the sphere Q_a with probability tending to one. Combining these three inequalities we have

$$\max(S_1 + S_2 + S_3) < -ca^2 + (b+p)a^3,$$

which is strictly negative for $a < \frac{c}{b+p}$. Thus, for any sufficiently small a, there exists a sequence of roots $\theta_n = \theta_n(a)$ to the minimum GSD estimating equation such that $P(||\theta_n - \theta^g||_2 < a)$ converges to one, where $||.||_2$ denotes the L_2-norm.

It remains to show that we can determine such a sequence independent of a. To see this, we let θ_n^* to be the root closest to θ^g. This exists since the limit of a sequence of roots is again a root by the continuity of the GSD measure. This completes our proof of the consistency part.

Proof of the asymptotic Normality (Part (b)): To prove the asymptotic normality, we have to expand $\sum_x K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_\theta(x)$ in Taylor series about $\theta = \theta^g$ to get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_x K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_\theta(x) &= \sum_x K(\delta_n^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{\theta^g}(x) \\ &\quad + \sum_k (\theta_k - \theta_k^g) \nabla_k \left(\sum_x K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_\theta(x) \right) |_{\theta=\theta^g} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k,l} (\theta_k - \theta_k^g)(\theta_l - \theta_l^g) \nabla_{kl} \left(\sum_x K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_\theta(x) \right) |_{\theta=\theta'}, \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

where θ' lies in between θ and θ^g.

Suppose θ_n is the solution of the minimum GSD estimating equation that is consistent by part (a) of the theorem. Replace θ by θ_n in the above equation (66) so that the LHS of the equation becomes zero and we get that

$$\begin{aligned}&-\sqrt{n} \sum_x K(\delta_n^g(x)) f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x) u_{\theta^g}(x) \\ &= \sqrt{n} \sum_k (\theta_{nk} - \theta_k^g) \times \left\{ \nabla_k \left(\sum_x K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_\theta(x) \right) |_{\theta=\theta^g} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_l (\theta_{nl} - \theta_l^g) \nabla_{kl} \left(\sum_x K(\delta_n(x)) f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) u_\theta(x) \right) |_{\theta=\theta'} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

Here, the first term within the bracketed quantity in the RHS of (67) converges to J_g with probability tending to one and the second bracketed term is an $o_p(1)$ term (as shown in the proof of the consistency part). Further Lemma A.4 gives us that

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{n}\sum_x K(\delta_n^g(x))f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x)u_{\theta^g}(x) &= \sqrt{n}\sum_x [K(\delta_n^g(x)) - K(\delta_g^g(x))]f_{\theta^g}^{1+\alpha}(x)u_{\theta^g}(x) \\ &= S_{1n}|_{\theta=\theta^g} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N_p(0, V_g).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get from Lemma 4.1 of Lehmann (1983) that the asymptotic distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\theta_n - \theta^g)$ is nothing but $N_p(0, J_g^{-1}V_gJ_g^{-1})$. □

References

Basu, A., Harris, I. R., Hjort, N. L., and Jones, M. C. (1998). Robust and efficient estimation by minimising a density power divergence. *Biometrika*, 85, 549–559.

Basu, A. and B. G. Lindsay (1994). Minimum disparity estimation for continuous models: Efficiency, distributions and robustness. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics 46*, 683–705.

Basu, A., Shioya, H. and Park, C. (2011). Statistical Inference: The Minimum Distance Approach. *Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL.*

Beran, R. J. (1977). Minimum Hellinger distance estimates for parametric models. *Annals of Statistics*, **5**, 445–463.

Bregman, L. M. (1967). The relaxation method of finding the common point of convex sets and its application to the solution of problems in convex programming. *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics 7*, 200–217. Original article is in *Zh. vȳchisl. Mat. mat. Fiz.*, **7**, pp. 620–631, 1997.

Broniatowski, M. and Keziou, A. (2009). Parametric estimation and tests through divergences and duality technique. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **100**, 16–36.

Broniatowski, M., Toma, A., and Vajda, I. (2012). Decomposable pseudodistances and applications in statistical estimation. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **142**, 2574–2585.

Cressie, N. and T. R. C. Read (1984). Multinomial goodness-of-fit tests. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B 46*, 440–464.

Dette, H. and Munk, A. (2003). Some methodological aspects of validation of models in nonparametric regression. *Statistics Neerlandica 57*, 207–244.

Ghosh, A. (2015). Asymptotic Properties of Minimum S-Divergence Estimator for Discrete Models. *Sankhya A: The Indian Journal of Statistics*, **77(2)**, 380–407.

Ghosh, A. and Basu A. (2015). The Minimum S-Divergence Estimator under Continuous Models: The Basu-Lindsay Approach. *Statistical Papers*, doi: 10.1007/s00362−015−0701-3.

Ghosh, A. and Basu A. (2016). Testing Composite Null Hypotheses based on S-Divergences. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, **114**, 38–47.

Ghosh, A., Basu A. and Pardo, L. (2015). On the robustness of a divergence based test of simple statistical hypotheses. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **161**, 91–108.

Ghosh, A., Harris, I. R., Maji, A., Basu, A. and Pardo, L. (2016). A Generalized Divergence for Statistical Inference. *Bernoulli*, to appear. Pre-print Technical Report (2013) at *BIRU/2013/3*, Bayesian and Interdisciplinary Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India.

Goutis, C. and Robert, C. P. (1998). Model choice in generalized linear models: A Bayesian approach via Kullback-Leibler projections. *Biometrika 85*, 29–37.

Hampel, F. R. (1974). The influence curve and its role in robust estimation. *J. Amer. Statist Assoc. 69*, 383–393.

Hampel, F. R., E. Ronchetti, P. J. Rousseeuw, and W. Stahel (1986). *Robust Statistics: The Approach Based on Influence Functions*. New York, USA: John Wiley & Sons.

Hodges, J. L. and Lehmann, E. L. (1954). Testing the approximate validity of statistical hypotheses. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society B 16*, 261–268.

Jimenez, R. and Y. Shao (2001). On robustness and efficiency of minimum divergence estimators. *Test 10*, 241–248.

Lehmann, E. L. (1983). *Theory of Point Estimation*. John Wiley & Sons.

Lindsay, B. G. (1994). Efficiency versus robustness: The case for minimum Hellinger distance and related methods. *Annals of Statistics 22*, 1081–1114.

Liu, J., and Lindsay, B. G. (2009). Building and using semiparametric tolerance regions for parametric multinomial models. *Annals of Statistics 37*, 3644–3659.

Pardo, L. (2006). *Statistical Inference based on Divergences*. CRC/Chapman-Hall.

Park, C. and A. Basu (2003). The generalized Kullback-Leibler divergence and robust inference. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation 73*, 311–332.

Rudas, T., Clogg, C. C. and Lindsay, B. G. (1994). A new index of fit based on mixture methods for the analysis of contingency tables. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society B 56*, 623–639.

Simpson, D. G. (1987). Minimum Hellinger distance estimation for the analysis of count data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 82*, 802–807.

Simpson, D. G. (1989). Hellinger deviance test: efficiency, breakdown points, and examples. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 84*, 107–113.

Tamura, R. N. and D. D. Boos (1986). Minimum Hellinger distance estimation for multivariate location and covariance. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 81*, 223–229.

Toma, A. and M. Broniatowski (2010). Dual divergence estimators and tests: Robustness results. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **102**, 20–36.